



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,984	02/05/2004	Otto Carl Ziemann	A01489	5214

21898 7590 01/31/2006
ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY
PATENT DEPARTMENT
100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106-2399

EXAMINER

RONESI, VICKEY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/772,984	Applicant(s) ZIEMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Vickey Ronesi	Art Unit 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

1. The claim objection and the 35 USC 102 rejection over Zuckert are withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment filed 11/10/2005. All other rejections are maintained.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.
3. The new grounds of rejection set forth below are necessitated by applicant's amendment filed 11/10/2005. In particular, claims 1, 4, and 7 have been amended. Thus, the following action is properly made final.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 4 is objected to because the amended term "fatty acids ester" is incorrect and should read as "fatty acid esters" like suggested in paragraph 1 of Office action mailed 8/10/2005.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bors et al (US 5,484,849).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 3 of Office action mailed 8/10/2005 and is incorporated here by reference.

Double Patenting

6. Applicant's statement on page 2 of the amendment filed 1/9/2006 regarding the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections is acknowledged. If the following double-patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in this application and if there is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection in the later-filed copending application, per USPTO practice, the examiner will withdraw the rejection.

7. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 and 7 of copending Application No. 10/858,872 (published as US PGPub 2004/0247783).

The discussion set forth in paragraph 4 of Office action mailed 8/10/2005 is incorporated here by reference. While US appl. '873 does not claim crosslinking groups, case law holds that those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in an application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619,622 (CCPA 1970). In particular, in the paragraph on pages 6-8 of the present specification, crosslinking groups are described which read on those presently claimed.

8. Claims 1 and 7 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 2 and 7 of commonly assigned copending Application No. 10/858,872 (published as US PGPub 2004/0247783).

Art Unit: 1714

The discussion set forth in paragraph 5 of Office action mailed 8/10/2005 is incorporated here by reference.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, applicant argues that Bors et al neither teaches nor discloses the claimed invention because it does not teach aqueous compositions having low VOC content.

In response to the argument, while Bors et al only exemplifies an aqueous composition with a VOC content of 7.6 wt %, nonetheless, given that the organic solvents (propylene glycol and diisopropyladipate) are not mandatorily present in Bors et al's composition and only seem to be a part of the inventive examples because it conveniently came in the package with the autoxidative additive (col. 5, lines 28-41; col. 8, lines 59-61) and given that low levels of solvent are desirable to avoid safety hazards, it is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to not utilize the optional organic solvents and obtain the presently claimed VOC. Further note that case law holds that it is perfectly proper for the examiner to look to the whole reference for what it teaches rather than merely rely on preferred embodiments.

In re Courtright 153 USPQ 735 (CCPA 1967).

Additionally, the data only compare methyl linoleate and methyl linoleate and is not commensurate in scope with the claims, especially claim 1. Case law holds that evidence is insufficient to rebut a *prima facie* case if not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention.

In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731, 741, 218 USPQ 769, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vickey Ronesi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 1714

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1/24/2006

vr



Vasu Jagannathan
VASU JAGANNATHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700